

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 30, 2004, the Examiner objected to the disclosure and rejected claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson (United States Patent No. 5,721,825, hereinafter referred to as “Lawson”) in view of Boukobza et al. (United States Patent No. 6,122,664, hereinafter referred to as “Boukobza”). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully provide the following:

Objection to the Disclosure

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure of the application because “the term “DSC” is not well-defined in specification or typing error in stead of meaning of the term “DCE” as discussed in the claims and other places in specification.” Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made herein to the specification overcome the objection made by the Examiner, are supported by the disclosure as originally filed and do not include new matter.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson in view of Boukobza. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim set as provided herein is not made obvious by the cited references.

The standard for a Section 103 rejection is set for in M.P.E.P 706.02(j), which provides:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on

applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the limitations claimed in the present invention. In particular, the independent claims as provided herein include limitations relating to defining specific types of events within the list of events that are to be monitored for a specific purpose; providing settings of the defined specific events in a plurality of registration lists; monitoring said specific events passed from one controller to another controller of said DCE; automatically determining if said passed specific events conform with any of the settings of the defined specific events; notifying a specific event consumer of the occurrence of said specific events that meet a criteria of said specific purpose; using said specific event consumer to automatically report the occurrence of said specific events that meet a criteria of said specific purpose by using one of a plurality of filters that are independently defined in accordance with pre-established criteria, wherein the filter used is associated with said specific event consumer to determine which final event consumer is to receive said report and in which of a plurality of available formats said report is provided; and recording a log of event activity involving only said specific events.

These limitations are supported by the disclosure as originally filed. For example, reference is made to page 12, line 1 through page 14, line 6 of the original disclosure. And, none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests such limitations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons provided herein, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. And, since the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art

references do not make obvious the independent claims as provided herein. And since the prior art references do not make obvious the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references cited by the Examiner do not make obvious the corresponding dependent claims, which depend from one of the independent claims.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons provided herein, the claim set as provided herein overcomes all rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not add new matter and that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request favorable reconsideration. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this communication, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

DATED this 30th day of July, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



David B. Tingey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,289

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 321-4814
Facsimile: (801) 321-4893

DBT:lc
770671